

VZCZCXYZ0003
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #0051/01 0290004
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 290004Z JAN 10
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 8083
INFO RUEHGG/UN SECURITY COUNCIL COLLECTIVE

UNCLAS USUN NEW YORK 000051

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PREL](#) [UNSC](#)

SUBJECT: TURKEY CHAIRS ITS FIRST UN SECURITY COUNCIL
COUNTER-TERRORISM COMMITTEE (CTC) MEETING

¶1. (U) SUMMARY: Turkish Permrep Ertugrul Apakan chaired his first UN Security Council CTC meeting January 21. The agenda included the CTC's work program for the next six months and a thematic discussion on implementation and assessment of Security Council resolution 1624 (2005). As there are some outstanding issues to resolve with respect to the work program, the Chair plans to host informal meetings the week of January 25th. The CTC agreed that the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) will create a separate section on its website that will focus on states' implementation and assessment of resolution 1624 and would invite member states to share comments with the CTC on their best practices for implementing resolution 1624. Experts from the 1540 (nonproliferation) committee attended as did Jean Paul Laborde, director of the UN's Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF). END SUMMARY.

¶2. (U) The chair outlined his ideas on the future work of the CTC and focused on new procedures for handling preliminary implementation assessments (PIAs). He proposed three options (outlined below) and asked for members' reactions. OPTION 1: The CTC would stop discussing PIAs at the committee level and adopt them after they are considered and approved by the subcommittees. If a member of the Committee breaks silence procedure, the PIAs will be discussed and adopted by the Committee. OPTION 2: The CTC would stop discussing PIAs in both the committee and subcommittees and use silence procedure to adopt them at both levels. A break of the silence procedure would require a discussion at the respective level (committee or subcommittees). OPTION 3: The PIAs would become solely an internal document of CTED and would not be considered or approved by the committee or subcommittees.

¶3. (U) Mexico said that it could support option 2 as a middle of the road approach. France said that it preferred option 3 but would support option 2. Austria said it liked option 1 so that the committee could retain more control over the process, but could move towards option 2 if necessary. The UK liked option 3 the best as there are risks the committee could be exposed to in politically approving documents under option 2 that it hasn't read. In the end though, the UK said it would support option 2 to achieve consensus. China said that it supported option 1 but could migrate to option 2. Russia agreed that streamlining the PIA process is necessary but said that moving to option 3 is a bit premature and at most would support option 2. Japan said that it would support option 2 as it would make the committee's work more efficient. USUN said that option 3 was preferable but could support option 2 to facilitate agreement with other members of the committee.

¶4. (U) The Chair also said he felt strongly that the CTC should streamline the work it does on approving country reports and that it should increase its dialogue with member states. He proposed a continuation of thematic discussions within the committee and said that he supported the idea of the Committee/Counter Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) organizing a sixth special meeting. In order to increase the

visibility of the CTC outside New York, the Chair said that he would consider the possibility of CTC members joining CTED on some of CTED's country assessment visits. Along the same lines, he said that he planned, as the Chair, to visit some international and regional organizations. Reactions were in general supportive, although the UK asked whether a sixth special meeting was necessary and suggested that the issue needed to be discussed in more detail by the committee. USUN, France, and Japan agreed with the UK. Russia said it thought the CTC had agreed to the notion of a sixth special meeting already, but nevertheless was open to discussing options.

15. (U) CTED said that 102 states have reported to the committee on implementation of resolution 1624 as of January, 2010. Regarding resolution 1624's "call for states to adopt such measures as may be necessary and appropriate and in accordance with their obligations under international law to prevent incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts", CTED suggested the CTC look for the following: legislation expressly targeting incitement to commit terrorist acts; or other legislation with similar effect (general offense of incitement; accessory offenses such as aiding and abetting, conspiracy, and facilitation. CTED suggested that the CTC continue to encourage member states to report, and that CTED develop a database of good practices, facilitate technical assistance and conduct wider outreach activities. Russia and the UK conveyed their support for CTED's ideas and said they were committed to states' implementation of resolution 1624. USUN also supported CTED's initiatives and explained that the Department of State has established a Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) unit that focuses on counter-radicalization and de-radicalization. USUN also conveyed that we are eager

to engage multilaterally on CVE issues and that in November 2009, the CVE unit hosted a multilateral workshop on CVE issues and will continue to do so periodically, including some with a regional focus.

RICE